

9

CHURCH & STATE .

HETEROGENEOUS;

OR

A LAYMAN

CORRECTING

Pletcher Dixon *K*
THE VICAR OF DUFFIELD,

IN REPLY TO A PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED

"A SERMON

Against Jacobinical & Puritanical Reformatiours."

PART THE FIRST.

"And will ye pollute my people for handfuls of barley, and for pieces
of bread?" Ezekiel, c. xiii, v. 19.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR AND SOLD BY H. D. SYMONDS, NO. 23,
PATERNOSTER-ROW, AND MARTHA GURNEY, NO. 128, HOLBORN,

LONDON,

1794.

Entered at Stationer's Hall.

9

PREFACE.

IF the Vicar of Duffield had not called his production a *Sermon*, nor himself stood in the character of a *Minister of the Gospel*, I should have spared any remarks thereon, but as it comes into the world in the motly garb of *Religion and Politics* with a view to urge (not with arguments to prove) the inseparable connection of Church and State, and to abuse Dissenters of every description in the lump, I have felt concern, that a text of the New Testament, and the expressions of Christ, the *Prince of Peace*, should be applied to cover a work which breathes a spirit so contrary to *his*; and apprehending that great name is thereby *dishonoured* and that the Holy Scriptures are *misapplied*, lest any honest minds should be in danger of being deceived, I am induced to attempt pulling off the sheep's coat, that violent and intolerant sentiments may appear in their own proper garb.

As the Vicar's sermon seems an essay to mix religion and politics, this reply is intended to separate them, or shew the connection to be dangerous.

The Vicar takes his text from the 3d chap. of Mark,
and 24th verse.

"If a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand."

ON WHICH HE BEGINS THUS,

"**T**HE various Governments and Kingdoms that have been brought to Ruin and Destruction by the civil and religious animosities of their inhabitants, are so many melancholy proofs of this assertion of our blessed Saviour, that we need no other conviction of the truth of his observation in this matter."

It appears from the passage of Scripture connected with the text, that the occasion of this remark from our Saviour, was that reproach of the Scribes, that "he cast out devils by Belzebub." The Scribes were of the establishment, like some in our day,—expounders of the law; Christ and his Apostles were despised, as unlearned itinerants: "Is not this the Carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James and Joses? &c. &c. Neither Right Reverend nor Reverend—" How knoweth this man letters having never learned?"

Thus we see the same spirit hath the same language in all ages. Distance of time, and
differ-

difference of name are nothing. That which is born after the flesh is flesh, John 3.—6.—and bringeth forth the fruits of the flesh.—Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, chap. iv, ver. 29, speaking of Isaac and Ishmael, says, “But as then, he that was born after the flesh, persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now.” And it may be added, as it was in the days of Christ’s personal appearance, even so it is now, agreeable to his own declaration—“If they have called the Master of the House Belzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?” And we find that persecutions have generally been carried on, or supported by the different national establishments: the conclusion is natural, that such establishments cannot be the Churches of Christ.

But to return to the text, it must appear to any person who reads the preceding and subsequent verses, that these expressions of Christ were figurative, and not applied to any outward commotions; but as the vicar takes no notice of that, and is silent on the real occasion of the remark which is his text, ’tis likely he would have no objection that his audience should understand it as if spoken on some political occasion.

Yet suppose it had been literally applied, it appears to me a very unfavourable text for the Vicar’s subject.—“That a Kingdom divided against itself cannot stand,” proves the *effect* but not the *cause of such divisions*. If it be admitted that a Kingdom cannot exist when divided, is it not wisdom in all who are friends

to such Governments, to consider what are the most likely means to *prevent* such division and avoid the consequences? Whatever the Vicar or any other may suppose can be done by human policy, I am most inclined to join in opinion with Solomon (who was a great and wise king) that "righteousness exalteth a nation." And if all who are called Ministers, Pastors, or Teachers of the People, were but preachers of righteousness in their example, more good fruits of their labour would be seen than now appear; —and next to this, as a secondary means greatly conducing to harmony and concord, amongst the subjects of any Government, is, their being placed on an equal footing with respect to religious Liberty at least. The Vicar is of another mind; but when it is considered that he is not only Vicar of Duffield, but also Chaplain in the army, his great zeal for Establishments and close union of Church and State, is easily accounted for.

In order more clearly to discover whether the Vicar's zeal is more influenced by public good or private interest, let a government be compared to a private family (whence I apprehend all government originated) What is the conduct of an affectionate and prudent parent towards his children, either in their minority, or when arrived to years of maturity? Is not the most likely way to ensure their affection and duty to him, and harmony among themselves, to carry an equal hand towards them, observing a necessary distinction in regard to conduct, impartially administering admonition

tion or encouragement as occasion requires? But suppose, independent of any consideration of this kind, the parent was to manifest some marks of peculiar favour to a part; this, I should suppose, would be opening a door for jealousies, which might grow into undutiful murmurs and gender contention and Strife amongst brethren; but how would disaffection be likely to increase if those favourite children had a separate table and different cloathing provided, to be supported out of the labour of the rest! And if this distinction made by the parent, should induce those children to conduct themselves in an overbearing manner towards their brethren, and insist on a conformity to their opinion, even on religious subjects, I think this must be in the full sense of the words, a house divided against itself, and not likely to stand.—I leave the *disinterested* reader to make his own serious reflections, how far this is analogous to national establishments, or any way points out the *cause* of divisions.

The Vicar dwells much on the dangerous effects of divisions, but if he hints at any thing as a *remedy* 'tis that which he should have assigned as the *cause*, viz. enforcing conformity to certain forms of worship. I should be sorry to do him injustice, but I cannot otherwise understand him than of the same remedy that hath been tried many hundred years, and always proved eventually unsuccessful. It was tried by Nebuchadnezzar, when he heated the furnace seven times hotter than usual. It was tried by the Jews, when the chief Priests and Pharisees held
a coun-

a council and said, "If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him, and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation." How blind is a narrow, selfish policy! How earnestly were they pursuing such methods, as would hasten the event that they dreaded. Be instructed, O ye teachers and shepherds, and say not within yourselves, we are the ministers of Christ. The Jews [said they were "Abraham's seed," but they did not the works of Abraham. If then ye be the ministers of Christ, let his spirit and example, influence your whole conduct; for "every tree is known by its fruit?"

If we consider the bloody persecutions of papists, was not the cause of religion the ostensible reason? And was not this all done under establishments? yet how many nations have shaken off the papal yoke! What cruelties were practised in this kingdom! yet all this did not prevent the increase of the Protestant Religion. And who could have believed, if experience had not proved it, that those who had lately been the persecuted could turn persecutors, refusing that Liberty to others which they themselves had so much desired? Or, are there any that can lay claim to the Christian Name, who can suppose, a protestant persecution differs from a papist persecution, except that it be more unnatural? A persecution by Jews, or Mahometans, may admit of some palliation, because they do not profess a belief in the doctrines of Christ.

I shall now give a quotation from the Vicar's

car's sermon, page 4. "Little more than a century past this kingdom experienced the scourge of a civil war, begun and continued for the space of many years, by a puritanical and merciless set of Reformers."

Now the Vicar cannot be ignorant what grievous persecution the Dissenters suffered previous to this. Can any sober, thinking man believe, that that Revolution and usurpation would have taken place, if all the subjects of this realm had been allowed the free exercise of religious Liberty?

Oliver Cromwell, in his speech to the Parliament in 1654, said, "All the money in the nation would not have tempted men to fight upon such an account as they have engaged, if they had not had hopes of Liberty, better than they had from Episcopacy, or than would have been afforded them from a Scottish Presbytery, or an English either." And he adds, "This I say, is a fundamental; it ought to be so; it is for us and the generations to come."

Here we may see a consequence of Establishments, and the union of Church and State; the Church was the oppressor, and the Prince the Sufferer. Thus have the antichristian Clergy in different ages, made Kings, Princes and Magistrates, as cat's paws, to effect their ambitious and avaricious designs.

I have no doubt but those expressions of Cromwell above quoted, were his genuine sentiments; but he who was so great a warrior and unconquered by the sword, was overcome by Church influence, so as to countenance in
one

one set of men what he had been laying waste in others: this exhibits another incontestable proof of the evil of an alliance between Church and State.

If Cromwell's testimony of Church influence on the Government of King Charles, as the occasion of his troubles, should not have sufficient weight with some, the same is confirmed by divers authorities. It appears that the King himself was sensible he had too much given way to the peevishness or avarice of some Ecclesiastics, by the following caution to his son, afterwards King Charles the second.

“Beware of exasperating any faction, by the crossness and asperity of some men's passions and private opinions, employed by you, grounded only upon differences in lesser matters, which are but the skirts and suburbs of religion. Christian Toleration often dissipates their strength, when rougher opposition fortifies, and puts the despised and oppressed party into such combinations, as may most enable them to get a full revenge on those they count their persecutors. Take heed that outward circumstances and formalities of religion devour not all.”

“Take heed of abetting any factions: your partial adhering to *any one side*, gains you not so great advantages in some men's hearts (who are prone to be of their King's religion) as it loseth you in others, who think themselves and their profession first despised, then persecuted by you.”

Can any mind possessing sensibility read
 B these

these expressions without being interested on the King's behalf, and thinking he fell a sacrifice to the union of Church and State ; and that (whatever his failings might have been) he evinced more of the spirit of christianity than those who professed to be his spiritual guides ?

In this reign a sermon was preached by one Sibthorp, in which he declared that " subjects were punishable for refusing to obey the commands of their sovereign, even if those commands were contrary to the laws of God, of nature, or of the nation. Manwaring affirmed, that " the King was not obliged to observe the laws of the kingdom ; but that subjects were bound in conscience to obey him, without restriction, on pain of eternal damnation," and was afterwards promoted to a Bishopric. Were not these some of the " loyal, pious, and learned clergy," whom the vicar laments being " driven from the holy altars ?" page 4. I would not be understood to suppose that all the clergy were arrived to the same pitch of iniquity, but have much better authority to believe them, in the general, very corrupt,* than the vicar has to call them " loyal or pious." What could he have said more to shame his own cloth ? If loyalty and piety be to honour and obey the laws of God and of our country, surely these men were vice versa, and consequently the mi-

* In Archbishop Laud's time, about an hundred godly and conscientious ministers in Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Kent, Surrey, and other shires, were in one summer, and the most in the circuit of one visitation, some silenced, some suspended, some also excommunicated, and with their wives and children exposed to beggary, and all calamities: Reply to relation of the conference, between Laud and Fisher, page 184.

nisters of Satan, and their *learning* must have been in his school.

But let me next give a short sketch of that Rev. Father, Laud, Bishop of London, who was the King's spiritual director, and (if historians may be credited) "ruled his conscience with the most despotic sway; being possessed of this pre-eminence, he disregarded the clamours of the people." "While the administration of the Hierarchy was left to his charge, he and his adherents humoured the king in his high notions of the prerogative, of which they resolved—to render the Ecclesiastical power altogether independent. Ecclesiastical courts were held by the bishops in their own names, without any reference or regard to regal authority." These courts kept a severe hand over the presbyterians, and all other non-conformists to the superstitious and idolatrous practices that were called divine ordinances, tho' as opposite to true gospel worship, as the falling down before Nebuchadnezzar's image.

The Vicar further complains, page 4, that in the places of these pious and loyal clergy, were substituted "unprincipled and illiterate men, who had no other mode of shewing their zeal for religion, but in defacing and ruining our churches, those venerable edifices erected by the piety of our ancestors." This panegyric on the papists (who were the builders of those masshouses, superstitiously and improperly called churches) clearly evinceth the Vicar's near attachment to the Romish establishment.

One of these whom the Vicar calls *sa-*
cri-

crilegious defacers of venerable edifices, tho' before the usurpation of Cromwell, was Sherfield, Recorder of Salisbury, who, with consent of the vestry, ordered some painted glass to be taken out of a window of St. Edmund's Church, where was a picture intended to represent God the Father, in the form of an old man; and for meddling with this Babylonish trumpery, Sherfield was fined 500l. in the Star Chamber; another proof of the effects of an alliance between Church and State.

But the Vicar adds p. 4 and 5, "making them (the venerable edifices) as some of the Jews did the holy temple at Jerusalem in our Saviour's time, a den of thieves by their sacrilegious plunders;" thus continuing as he set out, paying little regard to the genuine sense of the passage he quotes.

The Jews were reprov'd by Christ *for trading in the temple*, and making that house which was so peculiarly ordained an house of prayer, a house of merchandise—not for defacing or taking any thing from the building, which perhaps these degenerate Jews professed as much veneration for, as the Vicar does for the monuments of Popish superstition, and with much better reason; but by substituting gain, for godliness, they robbed the Almighty of his honour, and gave occasion for that just rebuke; "It is written, my house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves, Matt. 21—13, and Mark 11th 15 and 17.

Perhaps on a review of these passages, the Vicar might not only see that they were misapplied on the present occasion, but derive some instruction to himself by considering, whether he was a buyer or a seller, or a money-changer in the temple.

In a note, page 5. "Almost every ancient Church in this kingdom retains more or less the marks of their puritanical ferocity and outrage, to this very day."

As the Vicar's quotation of Scripture, proves so ill chosen for the purpose, I will endeavour to recite a passage more in point. "In the eight year of his reign, he (King Josiah) began to seek after the God of David his Father, and in the twelfth year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images. And they brake down the altars of Baalim in his presence, and the images that were on high above them he cut down; and he burnt the bones of the priests upon the altars, and cleansed Judah and Jerusalem, 2 Chron. 3, 4, 5." It is very probable that the priests of the High places, and of the images destroyed, who were thus deprived of their revenues, would be ready to give King Josiah some opprobrious epithets, as bad as "puritanical reformer," and call themselves the priests of the most High; but leaving them I return again to Bishop Laud, who, for his apostolic services was translated to the See of Canterbury. And being now primate of all England, he availed himself of the near alliance of *Church and State*,
to

to issue a proclamation in favour of wakes and other vulgar festivals, which he knew, the non-conformists (much to their credit) had a great dislike to, as being productive of irregularity and intemperance. How unworthy the patronage of a Christian Bishop!

“ About this time (1734) one Prynne published a book against “ Balls and Stage-plays, “ wherein were some reflections, ’tis said, that “ *Jeemed* levelled at the King, Queen and Hierarchy, for which the printer was fined 500l. “ and the author 5000l. and sentenced to perpetual imprisonment, and to lose his ears. These “ severe proceedings were intended to mortify “ the Presbyterians, to whom Laud was a professed enemy; and such was the spirit of intolerance that now prevailed, that even the “ Dutch and French Refugees were enjoined “ to conform to the English worship; in vain “ did they plead the privilege granted by four “ successive Monarchs, in vain did they implore “ the Archbishop’s protection.” Thus by persecution in the Church, and abuses in the State (in which ecclesiastics were also principal advisers) were the people ripened for the event that followed. The English liturgy and canons were also urged upon the Scots, until the people in that kingdom were provoked to rebellion; but what is the risk of a rebellion in comparison of the hope of a bishopric, or even a plurality? Therefore, say interested men,—the Church and State must be united, whatever be the consequence to prince or people.

The Vicar proceeds, page 7. “ What a variety

“riety of sectaries, of heresy and schisms from
 “our established Church, from the apostolic
 “faith and practice of our pious protestant an-
 “cestors, first sprung up at that time !” The
 Vicar here recollecting himself, useth the word
 protestant, before ancestors ; but those his pious
 ancestors who built the “*venerable edifices*”
 with all their imagery, were not protestants ;
 and to those pious ancestors, the protestants
 (with whom the Vicar now claims alliance)
 were “puritanical Reformers !”

But the fact is, that as the Protestant Church
 of England became more corrupt, even the
 sister of (idolatrous and persecuting) Rome as
 acknowledged by her prelates,* the sincere
 and truly religious of her members and com-
 municants became dissatisfied, and had the same
 religious ground for separation, which the first
 protestants had in separating from the Church of
 Rome ; for if protestants suffered even unto
 death because for conscience sake they could
 not conform to the ceremonies of that church,

* Bishop Laud says, “The Roman Church and the Church
 “of England, are but two distinct members of the Catholic
 “Church—a true Church in essence—an elder sister. Apost-
 “tolic she is, as being the See of one, and he a prime Apostle.”
 See relation of the conference between Laud and Fisher, the
 Jesuit.

Bishop Montague says, “The Church of Rome is, and ever
 “was a true Church, since it it was a Church.” See his Ap-
 peal to Cæsar, p. 139.

These are some of the heads of that pious and loyal Clergy,
 who the Vicar complains were driven from the holy altars by
 the puritanical Reformers ; but the fact is, the most pious
 and conscientious of the Clergy had been previously driven
 from the establishment, by these Romish misnamed Protestant
 Bishops, and their places filled with men more of their own
 stamp, or who could turn with the times.

would

would not the same principle support the same religious testimony against corruptions in the Protestant Church?

But the Vicar without proof or argument, *proceeds with declamation*, page 8, “ that
“ these different modes of religious worship
“ seem only formed to burlesque the practice of
“ the apostles, and insult the divine and excel-
“ lent form of worship, established by our na-
“ tional Church.”

Had he first proved from Scripture, that the national Church was in the practice of the Apostles, and then shewn from the same authority, wherein any particular societies of dissenters differ from that practice he would have done something; but as the first part might be a difficult task, and the second tedious; “ he includes all under heresy, who dissent from an establishment, as the most summary, tho’ not the most satisfactory way of proceeding. That a dissent from the establishment is heresy enough for all abuse on dissenters, may be seen page 9.

“ It is indeed much to be lamented by every
“ sincere christian, that there should exist at
“ this present time such apostacy from the *esta-*
“ *blished* religion of this realm.”

Was I to attempt a vindication of the tenets of all dissenters in a mass, because the Vicar has condemned them in a mass, it would indicate a disposition too much like his—he says “ they are innumerable and nameless,” and yet thinks himself competent to condemn them all as heretics, notwithstanding some of them differ *less*
from

from him than they do from each other; but they have left the Establishment," and so did the first protestants.

Was not the Roman Catholic religion *established*, and are not all *real* protestants apostates from that, and heretics, and would not such language be more consistent in the mouth of a Romish priest than a protestant Minister?

The great founder of the Christian Religion has left us a standard to try heresy and apostacy, different from, and more certain than the Vicar's, viz. "*By their fruits ye shall know them;*" therefore if the Vicar found a difficulty to support all his tenets, and to censure those of the dissenters on scripture authority, he might by comparing the fruits of the members and ministers of the different dissenting societies one with another, and the best of them with those of the establishment, be enabled to judge with more certainty, and consequently furnish his hearers and readers with something more convincing for their decision, on the advantage of Establishments, and union of Church and State. But he says, "the civil and ecclesiastical polity of this country, are so connected and congenial with each other, that men can scarce insult the one without injuring and wounding the other."

Here is a confession of faith, not in Christ who is the head of the true Church, but in the arm of civil power. Christ said, "the gates* of hell should not prevail against his Church;" therefore that Church which man can prevail against is not the Church of Christ.

* This appears to allude to the Councils of the Jews, which were sometimes held in the gates of their cities.

Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world," John 18—36; but the civil power is over the affairs of this world, for the well ordering of civil society, and it is the duty of christians to submit thereto: "the rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil;" they are for the punishment of "evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well, for they bear not the sword in vain." See Romans 13, Peter 2. Here we find a true distinction, and no connection between Church and State.

Christians owe due subjection to the civil power, in things that relate to civil society; but in things that relate to the conscience, they are the subjects of another kingdom, which is not of this world;" but if any man should plead religion or conscience, to vindicate a conduct injurious to his neighbour, or subversive of the order of civil society, he is made manifest and cognizable by the law; for every tree is known by its fruit, and every man is known by his conduct, and not by his Creeds and forms of worship.

It is not to be much wondered at, if amongst the various societies of dissenters (which the Vicar says are "innumerable and nameless") there should be some scabby sheep as well as in the Establishment, and that many are within that pale I think he will not attempt to deny, and if it would be uncharitable and unchristian-like to condemn the whole flock, because of these corrupt members (whether they be teachers or hearers) is it not equally so or more so in the Vicar to condemn and abuse all of every society but his own? I think there are ministers of
the

the establishment who cannot approve of such conduct, men who have more liberality, and not less understanding than the Vicar of Duffield, and perhaps not less interested for the welfare of Church and State, but less afraid of their temporal emoluments.

As the union of Church and State is now preached up as essential to the welfare of both, how came the Apostles and other faithful ministers of the gospel to omit enforcing, or even mentioning a subject of such importance? I think the answer is easy—while the gospel was "*preached freely*," the assistance of the Civil Power was not wanted in the Church; but when in the dark night of apostacy from the truth, men began to make *a trade* of preaching, they saw it needful to have assistance from the powers of the earth, and to secure which more effectually, they have endeavoured to persuade princes and people, that Church and State have an essential connexion, than which nothing can be more false, has been shewn both from the experience of many ages, and the testimony of holy writ, if it be meant that Church of which Christ is head, for "all power in heaven and on earth is given unto him," Matt. 28—18, and he needs no human help; but lest the testimony of Christ should be not sufficient for all that would be called Christians, I will add the testimony of the prophet Isaiah concerning the Church. "I the Lord do keep it; I will water it every moment; lest any hurt it, will I keep it night and day," Isaiah 27—3. "I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands, and thy walls are continually before me." Ibid

Ibid 49. Here is protection to the Church of Christ: but further, "I will lay thy stones with fair colours, thy foundations with sapphires: In righteousness shalt thou be established;" Isaiah 54, (not by human laws). But such as would be accounted ministers and officers in the Church, and abide not in the doctrine of Christ, have not *this foundation* to stand upon, they have not his defence and protection, and *therefore* they desire to attach themselves to the Civil Power, because by it alone they receive and hold their titles, honours and revenues, which Christ hath forbid to his ministers. "He told them his kingdom was not of this world, John 18—36, therefore, they that have recourse to the powers of the earth in the cause of religion, thereby declare that they are not the subjects of Christ's kingdom, nor members of his Church.

"If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight. John 18—36. Christ's weapons are not carnal, and his Apostle's weapons are not carnal, see 2 Cor. 10—4: But Antichrist must be in opposition to Christ, his kingdom is of this world, and therefore do his servants and ministers fight. "He that putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare war against him, Micah 3—5, which they cannot do effectually without aid from the civil power; therefore they call on the princes of the earth to secure those honours, titles, distinctions and possessions, *which cannot be held under Christ*; their views and interests are carnal, and therefore their weapons are carnal. But what saith the same prophet concerning the enemies of the Church? Thy
destroy-

destroyers, and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee, *Isaiah* 49—17; here is shewn that the enemies of the Church are within her, and not from without (those that have the name of Christ, but deny his life and power by an opposite practice). Such as these were complained of by the Prophet *Jeremiah* 23 c. v. 11. “Both prophet and priest are prophane, yea in my house have I found their wickedness saith the Lord.” And as Christ said, a man’s enemies are those of his own house, even so the worst enemies of the Church are in the Church, men of corrupt minds as *nominal members*: it is therefore the work of the faithful to purge the Church of such unclean members, by the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God,” *Ephesians* 6—17, and not to fill the Church by the sword of the Magistrate, which the Vicar has given too much reason to suspect is a method more “*congenial*” with his views. He proceeds page 12, “If we suffer our religion to be mutilated and corrupted, what can we expect, but that our Laws and Government will next fall a sacrifice;” Laws and Government have never fallen a sacrifice to religious liberty, but often to the want of it, and the increase of power and ambition in the National Priests. King Charles’s testimony, and some transactions in his reign in support of this assertion, and as the fullest refutation of the Vicar that can be given (he having particularly referred to that time) are already quoted, page 9. But the History of England from an early period,* fur-

* In the reign of King Stephen, a rebellion was excited by the insolence of the Clergy, and we read of no puritanical Reformers

nishes abundant reason to believe that there have seldom arisen any great evils to the state, where priests of the establishment have not been the occasion.

But what are we to understand by suffering our religion to be mutilated, &c? 'Tis out of the power of one man, or of one Church, to corrupt the religion of another. What then does he mean by *suffering* religion to be mutilated and corrupted? Not to suffer, must be to use some means to prevent. By religion then I conclude, that the Vicar intends the forms of the establishment, and by corruption, I suppose he means all non-conformists, and that these should *not be suffered* to worship the

formers then. Henry the 2d had much trouble by the arrogance of Becket, Bishop of Canterbury, to whose shrine the king went in penance three miles bare-foot, and was scourged with four-score lashes on his naked back. King John had much trouble from the intrigues of the Clergy, till at last he resigned his Crown to their great Bishop, the Pope.

In Henry the 4th's reign, a conspiracy was formed, in which the Bishop of Carlisle was a principal, and Maudlin a priest, was set up for King, but not succeeding, another rebellion was raised, at the head of which was the Archbishop of York. The King seeing the Clergy so dangerous from their power, endeavoured to engage their favour, which enabled them to raise a severe persecution as is thus briefly expressed.

"But courts the priest their favour to engage,

"Hence, Lollards felt dire persecutions rage."

The same Church influence operated to mischief, in the reign of Henry the fifth, of whom 'tis said—

"A vicious Prince a virtuous King became,

"But Priests indulged, kept England in a flame."

James the first was entertained by the students of Cambridge University with a Comedy, entitled *Ignoramus*, composed with a view to ridicule the the Common Law of England, and flatter the King on his prerogative, as being more "*congenial*" with the hierarchy.

Almighty

Almighty in any other way, however more consistent with their own judgment.

If the Vicar can give a more favourable explanation of his meaning, I should be glad to find that I am mistaken; but until then, I must consider it a broad hint that a repeal of the Toleration Act would not be unacceptable to him: he would then have greater scope for his zeal in support of what he calls ecclesiastical Government, and suppressing Heresy: what fines, whippings, confiscations, imprisonments, banishments (*and perhaps the stake*) might then be employed to make converts to christianity? Such things have been practised in this country, and the same disposition with the same power would revive them; and this is the spirit of antichrist, whether it be a papal protestant, or in whatever church, or under whatsoever name it may appear; and the same mercenary priests that cry up Church and State, and flatter princes to secure them in their benefices and power, and to persecute those that refuse to put into their mouths, would be as ready to depose a king who thwarted their designs as to oppress his subjects. The papists judge it lawful to compel the King (if they be but strong enough) to be of their Church, that he may be their engine, and this is no more than the natural consequence, or effect of the doctrine of establishments, and union of Church and State, for according to this doctrine (which is papal orthodoxy) either the Church must be of the King's religion be that what it will, or the King must conform to the establishment however contrary to his conscience, so that in a country where
dissenters

dissenters are tolerated, the king has not the liberty of a subject. What a system of contention is this, to be called the Church of Christ! It sprang from Rome, and it leads to Rome with all her train of cruelties—Has not the Pope on slight pretences of heresy deposed princes, and set up their subjects against them; and have not protestants deposed princes on religious pretences, the natural consequence of the Civil Power interfering with religion, and the Church meddling with the government?

Christ has left us example and precept, to “render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsars, and unto God, the things that are his;” but he never said that Cæsar should make laws for *his Church*, nor that the Church should impose Creeds on Cæsar—he meddled not with the kingdoms of this world, he “*sought not his own glory*,” and he that would be his disciple must follow his example—he said “if any man will come after me, let him *deny himself* and take up his cross daily and follow me, Luke 9—23.

Now here is a touchstone that would try the foundations of both Clergy and Laity—members of the establishment, and dissenters of every denomination. These that under a name of religion, are seeking wealth, popularity and power, and to be called of men Rabbi, are “seeking their own glory;” and what is the daily cross of those? It is that they have *not greater preferments* and more honour; but this is not the Cross of Christ, and therefore these are not the sheep of Christ: they neither hear his voice nor follow him.

In the foregoing pages I apprehend sufficient evidence has been adduced to prove,

That a union of Church and State has no foundation either in religion or sound policy; that a National Establishment of *any particular form of worship* has a natural tendency to *weaken* the hands of Government, and to introduce corruption into the Church, which has begot persecutions, and occasioned Revolutions in the State; that Christ's Kingdom, and the Kingdoms of this World are distinct, and that the true Worship of Almighty God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth (before whom "the nations are as a drop of a bucket,") can neither be prescribed nor prevented by human laws.

There still remains a "*Cloud of Witnesses*" which may yet come forward against the Vicar: But at present I close with earnestly recommending to him, *and to all men of a like spirit*, the serious consideration of the following testimony of Bishop Burnet in his Apology for the Church of England:

"I will not deny but many of the Dissenters were put to great hardships in many parts of England; I cannot deny it, and I am sure I will never justify it---And I will boldly say this that if the Church of England after she is got out of this storm, will return to hearken to the peevishness of *some four men*, she will be abandoned both of God and Man, and will set both Heaven and Earth against her.

